

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 FIKRI BAYRAMOGLU,

11 Petitioner,

No. CIV S-11-0699 DAD P

12 vs.

13 J. TIM OCHOA,

14 Respondent.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of
17 habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma
18 pauperis. This court will not rule on petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis.

19 Petitioner is incarcerated in Riverside County and his underlying judgment of
20 convicted was entered in the Marin County Superior Court. Marin County is in an area embraced
21 by the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

22 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d), courts in both the district of conviction and the
23 district of confinement have concurrent jurisdiction over applications for habeas corpus filed by
24 state prisoners. Because petitioner was not convicted in this district, and is not presently
25 confined here, this court does not have jurisdiction to entertain the application.

26 /////

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. This court has not ruled on petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis;

2. This matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d); 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

DATED: March 23, 2011.



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD:kly
bayr0699.108b